

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/027,994

Applicant(s)

BORDER ET AL.

Examiner

Hai C Pham

Art Unit

2861

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C Pham. (3) _____

(2) Clyde Bailey, Attorney. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Miyawaki et al. (U.S. 6,329,265).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative points out that the claimed micro-sized article is actually a set of micro lenses as compared to semiconductor device as taught by the prior art. However, the claimed element is not specifically spelled out as being micro-sized lenses, and thus any micro structured device would be applicable. On the other hand, the examiner agrees that the cited prior art does not clearly disclose the fiducial mark being formed by using the claimed optical feature to focus a light beam onto the second surface of the substrate supporting the micro-sized article. The examiner indicates that further search would be needed..



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/16/03